DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 092 HE 001 420

AUTHOR Koile, Earl A.
TITLE The University Can Be a Personal Place.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis.
PUB DATE 66
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at a series of Seminars on the Social Psychology of the Future State Metropolitan Campus, The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, April 18, 1966

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.30
DESCRIPTORS *Faculty, *Higher Education, Relevance (Education), Student Attitudes, Student College Relationship, *Student Development, Student Needs, *Students, *Student Teacher Relationship

ABSTRACT

Students are diverse; they desire involvement in governance, need guidance, react strongly to the impersonal, and bureaucratic life of the university, and want relevance and meaning in the learning program. Students also desire and need some personal relationships with the faculty and they need a faculty that cares. Students can be most influential in involving the faculty with the university and in personalizing university life. In the future, grades will probably have to go, and the curriculum will concentrate on both the intellectual and emotional development of the student. Juniors and seniors should be allowed "to choose faculty advisers who are models and then study the nature of the relationship and the uses faculty and students can make of them." Upper classmen could be used to work with incoming freshmen. Unfortunately, female students have few women faculty members with whom they can identify. Transitional seminars should be developed for graduating seniors to explore their development and their hopes for the future with interested and knowledgeable faculty members. (AF)

ED038092

THE UNIVERSITY CAN BE A PERSONAL PLACE

Earl A. Koile
Professor, Educational Psychology
The University of Texas

STUDENTS AND THE UNIVERSITY

HE001 420

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE UNIVERSITY CAN BE A PERSONAL PLACE*

Earl A. Koile
Professor, Educational Psychology
The University of Texas

STUDENTS AND THE UNIVERSITY

Today all over America college and university students have become controversial and we are more than a little perplexed by them. Hardly a week goes by without the newspapers, journals of opinion, and news magazines reporting diverse accounts of students and what they are doing. The popular interest is also paralleled within the university establishment by professional articles and reports of research on students and their campus environments.

The parents of the college students are heard from least, unless, of course, they happen to be journalists--or professors. On the whole, this preoccupation with the college student is a healthy enterprise and makes the university a livelier place in which to work; it may even yield needed educational reforms.

I must admit, however, that when I am away from my own campus and read current accounts of students I get the impression that no one is going to class, except perhaps a few faculty members who have not been invited to Washington. Yet, back on campus the classrooms are full, for better or for worse.

When I compare my own students against the descriptions I read, I am hard put to make the two fit. And yet, the descriptions have some pertinence. The problem is that students are described in "either-or" categories and they seldom fit them.

In a general way it is probably true that students are all the things we read about them, all the things we see in them, even the things we say about them. They may even be the things they say about themselves. What makes understanding them difficult, of course, is that in groups and as individuals they behave differently at different times and in different situations.

---

*Presented at a Series of Seminars on the Social Psychology of the Future State Urban Campus, The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, April 18, 1966.

There may be both unhealthy and healthy aspects of this intensive focus on the college student, and I would like to mention some of them. If our need for understanding students is a need for containing and controlling them because of our own anxieties and doubts about what we are doing, we may not be able to take educational advantage of what students are telling us. If the search for what students are like ends only with broad generalized descriptions of student bodies and particular groups of students, we will not understand the rich, varied, and more subtle and unique qualities that every student possesses or has promise to possess.

So, while I want to share in the creation of murals depicting students and their campus life, I want to hope that we not lose our facility for individual portraits and that we not project portraits out of caricatures. For I am arguing that the good of it all--in higher education and in the larger society--can be determined on by its worth for the individual person. John Gardner could have been speaking for higher education a few weeks back when he said: "If the Great Society is to mean anything, it must mean something for the quality of our lives . . . a means to capture the benefits of technology without losing our individual identity . . . a society of opportunity, a compassionate society designed to serve the individual and preserve his dignity."[1]

Students need opportunities to examine accounts of what they are like with an awareness of individual uniqueness, of healthy departures from the norms--if they are norms--and with a mixture of involvement and detachment. It is natural that students be preoccupied with themselves and want feedback against which to test their own personality and behavior and their own development as persons. Current reports on students, taken alone, are not satisfactory as feedback for evaluation. While recognizing value in some reports, we can also recognize that students may over-subscribe, believing that this is what they are like, and feel pressed to act out the myths. They also may under-subscribe and ignore or deny some interesting and valuable aspects of behavior that may apply to them.

We might find it profitable to use some of the better descriptions of students in small group discussions with them to check out the relevance in a climate of free expression and exploration and to examine the discrepancies as well as the consistencies between reports of what students are like and how they see themselves. These discussions

---

[1] Newsweek, February 28, 1966, Vol. LXVII, No. 9, p. 23.

with students may help us to hear what they are saying about themselves and about their education.

THE MEANING OF WHAT STUDENTS SAY

It is important for us to listen to students as deeply as possible. It would seem rash in each instance to decide to do what students say they want done or to interpret students' manifest behavior as direct evidence of their needs. I, therefore, am not advocating that we do what students say, but that we listen and do what their behavior tells us they need.

Let me illustrate briefly what I mean. Student action advocating reforms may grow out of the deep sense of conviction and commitment, at least a tentative commitment, to human values. It may also be a natural part of adolescent striving for maturity and a test of authority through which the student seeks to discover his own strength and limitations. The meaning of student actions is not always clear but often can be checked. In either event the students may be telling us that they need running room, that they are important, that they need to be valued, and that they need to be heard.

Students are pressing for involvement in college policy formulation and for participation in the university faculty committees. This push may mean many things and we can check out the meanings through listening to students. Its meaning may vary from campus to campus, from student to student, from group to group. It can mean disenchantment with the system and genuine desire for educational reform. Student pressures can mean that they want to be identified with important, worthy university goals and programs without knowing what their own contributions might be. Here again student action does not suggest that we rush them into membership on every university committee, but that we work with them in discovering what contributions they can make and what their efforts mean in terms of their own development as persons.

Students are reacting against established rules and regulations that have been on the statutes for many years. Their expressions may not mean that all rules, regulations and behavior standards should be overthrown or necessarily that they are pushing for a new morality. Their behavior may mean that they want to discover the relevance of the rules for their lives.

I do not want to deny that there are genuine differences in beliefs among students, faculty members, and

administrators and that some of them may not be reconcilable. I wish to suggest that the task for the educator is not necessarily to do what the students say, but to bring students into the process of discovering what they need and to develop programs based, in part at least, on these needs.

Recently a member of a university governing board, when approached by students on the need for broader counseling opportunities for individual students was puzzled that one day students wanted to be emancipated and to be involved in running the university, and the next day they wanted to be assured that professors and counselors were made available to help them guide their paths and directions through the university. There are interesting examples of such apparent inconsistencies. Students are inconsistent in their development. At the same time, I am not at all sure that the behavior of these students was inconsistent. In both instances they wanted to be helping faculty members and administrators on problems in the university and were asking faculty members and others to help them work with their problems.

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE UNIVERSITY

Students are reacting strongly to the impersonal, organized, and bureaucratic life in America and in the university, but they are not certain about what to replace it with. In a vague way, they want closer relations with the faculty. They are rather clear about wanting to be involved in the policy-making processes of the university, but again, they are vague on what their roles would be. What they discover as they get onto more committees and into the labyrinth of academic procedures is that they lose their vigor, their freshness, and their simplicity in approach to educational problems. Still, they need to be involved--both for themselves and for what they may be able to contribute.

The argument for student involvement in educational reform, policy making, and other affairs of the university does not deny the value of the specialties and expertise of the administrators and faculty. It does insist that the students have contributions to make by virtue of being students, that they do have a special sensitivity to their own needs and perhaps to the needs of the larger society, and that the knowledge of the specialists will mean less unless it can be brought into some kind of meaningful relationship and understanding with and for students. Perhaps we can yet discover how student and faculty contributions can be interrelated to yield better educational policies, processes, and results.

STUDENTS IN CAMPUS CONTEXT

One point is becoming increasingly clear to me. We cannot talk intelligently about college students any more without talking about the context of their behavior and without considering the behavior of adults around them. Usually this means faculty members, administrators, and other staff members on campus. At college we have little or no contact with parents, but we can look at how students relate to or react against faculty, staff, and other authority figures. This means that as educators we certainly need to give consideration to our own behavior in relation to students to try to understand what we may be doing to foster different kinds of student behavior.

It is true that faculties and administrators do need to know more about students, but they also need to know a great deal more about themselves in relation to students. Needed also is greater knowledge of the different elements in the campus environment and how they influence students and the educational process.

HOW STUDENTS IDENTIFY

I believe that we need to learn more about the processes by which students identify with specific elements of the large university. The processes and nature of identification are important if we assume that students can influence and be influenced by people and programs in the academic community. We might find the identification processes associated with different types of subcultures within the university structure. Perhaps in the developing relationship between the student and the types of subcultures and groupings within the university we would witness a coming together of the psychology of the individual and the social psychology of the campus environment. We might come to understand which kinds of people and what particular program elements contribute most to the goals of education.

Many students feel presumptuous in thinking that they should be a close and interwoven part of the university community. Recently I had occasion to ask a group of fraternity men what they felt most closely associated with in their university, and what they considered as "theirs and not theirs" in terms of relatedness to them. The questions were worded in several ways to get their impressions of their own personal encounters and relationships with the university. Their answers came slowly. First they could agree that they felt more freedom in thinking of themselves as a part of the university when they were back home or away from campus during the summer. They seemed to be

saying that when others identified them with the university and when not everybody in the home community could be so identified, they too could feel a part of the university.

The upperclassmen frequently mentioned their major fields of study and contacts with professors in the field. Freshmen and sophomores made no such references. As might be expected, these men mentioned some of the campus organizations, including their fraternities, but there was reluctance to do this, for they were not sure that student organizations were relevant parts of the university.

Seniors expressed regret that they had not been more deeply involved in relationships with professors who were committed to ideas that might possibly suggest commitments for them; they expressed disenchantment with the system that emphasized grade-getting and with themselves for allowing the system to dominate them. Freshmen, interestingly enough, seemed to be expressing a zest for the gamesmanship required to survive in the system.

In this meeting, as in others which I have held in recent weeks with groups of students, there seemed to be an unusual interest in broad problems and issues in higher education and in their own university. Students are hungry to be involved in their own learning programs and to tackle the important problems of their university. They are a good deal less interested in the let's pretend activities on the campus and a good deal more interested in active involvement in programs with which faculty members and administrators are concerned. The most promising development in higher education today may be the press for active involvement of students in educational policy, program development, and evaluation.

While we know very little about how students identify with people and how they use the resources in the university, we can sense, as Dean Williamson has pointed out in his writings and speeches, that administrators and students are searching for new definitions of student-university relationships. The student activist movement and pressures for involvement in university affairs call attention to the need for new relationships. Parenthetically, there seems to be little going on in the search for new relationships between faculty members and administrators. This, it seems to me, is essential in the development of a climate for faculty growth and productivity.

"WARM BUT AGGRAVATING" RELATIONSHIP

Philip Jacob confronted faculty members and

administrators in higher education a few years ago with charges (a) that college students, for the most part, hold homogeneous values regardless of their backgrounds and the claims colleges make; (b) that colleges tend to homogenize their students rather than to foster individuality; (c) that liberal arts programs probably have no more effect on student values than the newer general education curricula or professional-vocational oriented curricula; and (d) that neither the quality of the teaching nor the method of instruction has more than minor influence on student value outcomes or judgments. Jacob also pointed out that student personality characteristics filter their learning experiences, but that some institutions do seem to have impact on the values of their students because of the unique climates, of appealing faculty members with strong values, and because of other unidentified personal experiences.[1]

Jacob concluded that "...college can contribute to the growth of a student's values only when it penetrates the core of his life and confronts him with fresh and often disturbing implications, which are different from those which he and his society have taken for granted. This can hardly occur as a by-product of a curricular assembly line. It requires a highly personal relationship between the college community and the individual student--a relationship that is warm and considerate, but at the same time mutually aggravating."[2]

Two conditions Jacob poses for college influence are, in my opinion, vital, even though not the only ones. That the higher learning must reach the student in deep and personally relevant ways is not news, but it apparently continues to be an infrequent occurrence for students. What intrigues me more are Jacob's suggestions that confrontations with students must have disturbing implications for them and that the personal relationship between the individual student and the academic community--presumably the faculty and staff--must be both "warm and considerate" on the one hand and "mutually aggravating" on the other.

It seems to me that if an aggravating relationship is to have more than nuisance value for a student it must honestly represent a deep concern or dilemma of the institution which can be shared with students. For example, staff members who keep talking to their students about student desires to be

---

[1]Habein, Margaret L., editor, Spotlight on the College Student, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1959, p. 4.

[2]Op. cit., p. 5.

involved in policy formulation and in their rights as citizens are far more likely to create a mutual respect and a climate for learning than staff members who simply show their aggravation directly toward the students for being a bother. What I am saying is that it seems all right to be concerned, even aggravated, so long as the focus of concern or aggravation is on real problems and we do not scapegoat students. It requires a very special university climate to maintain a balance of warmth, perspective, and patience to search for the real problems and issues.

Faculty members and administrators, like students, often may fight the wrong battles in the wrong arena. We have seen this going on in the student demonstrations over the country. While honest convictions have been represented and have been acted upon in the arena of student freedom, responsibility, and civil rights, there has also been some acting out of hostile and aggressive behavior stemming from deeper and more personal psychological needs. Similarly, college administrators often may be tempted to use the current arena in which they find themsleves (whether involvements over relationships with students or with faculty) to express their own frustrations which result from unresolved conflicts in other problem areas associated with their terribly demanding tasks and their own self-structures.

STUDENTS AND THE FACULTY

STUDENTS STILL NEED THE FACULTY

Gardner Murphy of the Menninger Foundation, in a recent symposium said that college students "...need breadth of curriculum within which... to achieve specialized mastery ..., a high degree of individualization in the teaching given them..., [and] ...the warmth, the intimacy, the identification possibilities which come only from a teacher who believes in them as individuals and has enough time, thought, patience, leisure, imagination, and faith in human nature to be able somehow to offer all this so that the individual studnet feels it."[1]

There is much concern among students even some faculty members about the lack of contacts and personal relationships between students and faculty. We know in some general way that faculty members and students are important to each other, even though each may be important to the

---

[1]"The Challenge of College Teaching: A Plea for Individuation," The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 26, No. 4, December 1965, pp. 399-407; quote from pp. 403-404.

other for different reasons. For generations the persistent problem of student-faculty relationships has not been well understood in terms of how student-faculty interaction influences the behavior of both.

David Riesman[1] suggests that students are guarded, that they fear closeness with faculty members. The reason, he points out, is that teachers are more effective and students fear being influenced by them. This is to suggest that the faculty members cannot be written off, that they must be taken seriously and that some students tend to feel somewhat in awe in relation to their professors.

What, then, do students want in relation to faculty? Eventually we will need to know more about which students get what in relationships with which faculty members.

FACULTY MEMBERS WHO CARE

Meanwhile we continue to recognize the importance of having a lively, dynamic, zestful faculty member who cares about students, but who might care even more about helping them learn what his discipline can mean to them personally and perhaps professionally. If a faculty member is to care about students, more often than not a legitimate medium of his caring should be his specialty, which in itself might be enough if he concerns himself with how it can have relevance in the lives of students. No teaching of any subject need be perfunctory if it can be an experience of relevance both for faculty and students. But if the professor's discipline, as he teaches it, has no significance for him, can it possibly then have significance for his students?

In expressing the belief that a person's specialty can enhance his relationship with students and need not be a bar to involvement with them, I recognize that specialization can be a bar and that it has been in colleges and universities over the country. The argument is not against specialization, for to deny the value and need for specialization would be to deny living in this century. I simply want to press the argument that specialization can work for people, even in relationships.

WAYS OF CARING

While discussing the importance of relationships in which people care about each other and care about learning,

---

[1] "Student Culture and Faculty Values," Spotlight on the College Student, edited by Margaret L. Habein, American Council on Education, 1959, pp. 8-31.

I am not advocating that faculty members be fathers and mothers to students in any paternalistic sense. Paternalism may be a form of authoritarianism wrapped in the cloak of knowledge and expertise which only the authority can have and which students must accept on his terms. And, of course, caring about each other is not enough. The college student, as well as the faculty member, needs to learn to care about his area of study and inquiry, and about the meaning his discipline can have in terms of one's commitments to life and to the society in which his life is lived.

But this raises the paramount question of how do we, as faculty members or persons, learn for ourselves, and how do we,communicate to our students something of the process by which we continually develop a renewed zest for living, for exploration, for meaning and productivity.

One task, it seems to me, is to try to bring the students to the edge of our thinking in our specialty and to share with them the problems and dilemmas we face in our research, in our encounter with ideas. Clearly, this is more difficult in some disciplines than in others. Yet I find students most receptive to difficult and complex ideas if the intent is to enable them to discover the relevance in their lives and in the society in which they are living.

DICHOTOMIES NOT HELPFUL

The dichotomies in educational program conceptualizations in higher education do not help us. I am speaking of the dichotomies between thinking and feeling, between theory and application, between content and process, and between learning from books and lectures on the one hand and learning from experience on the other. These dichotomies tend to obscure what takes place in learning that is deeply meaningful to the student as a person.

Research and experience growing out of group dynamics, group psychotherapy, and social interaction generally, and increased knowledge of individual behavior, suggest value in integrating theory and its application to specific situations; value in imposing no limits on the reaches of the intellect and the breadth of the emotions of students; value in allowing, actually fostering, the explorations of ideas and feelings wherever they seem to go, seeking meaning in them whether they manifest themselves in experiences called ideas or in experiences called feelings.

Fortunately, most of us know professors who never seemed to be aware of the false dichotomies in education. Often these are the professors about whom there is a good

deal of subjective judgment and persistent evidence from students as well as from colleagues testifying to their good teaching. These are the professors who do seem to make a difference in the lives of students; who do seem to excite them; who do seem to combine the intellectual and personal worlds--combining, perhaps, in Gardner Murphy's term, "...fire in the belly and power in communication." These are the professors for whom both love and knowledge are relevant in learning.

INDIVIDUALIZING AN EDUCATIONAL ENCOUNTER

I have talked about the need for learning to have relevance. How do we make an educational experience personally relevant? What are the degrees of relevance? We know (a) that some learning may be intensely relevant now and that other learning may become relevant later; (b) that we have to be concerned with present and future relevance; (c) that all learning cannot be relevant every hour of the day, if for no other reason than our inability to withstand intensity and so much stress; and (d) that to individualize does not mean one-to-one relationships exclusively between faculty members and students, or even between counselors and students, for that matter. We all know about highly relevant personal experiences that take place in a group or even in a crowd.

So while the matter of personal relevance is of importance, we have difficulty in defining it for students. In some ways we know that they have to define it for themselves. Our curriculum has not allowed enough of this. I am slowly coming to the point where I am willing for the faculty member to define personal relevance, but only for himself, not for the student. I am coming to discover that I do not have as much to say as I thought I did about what is important for students. Consequently, I am about to settle for an answer to the question of what is relevant and important for me. If I can do this and attempt to share concerns of importance, including the knowledge, skill, personal meaning, and values, and leave more room for the students to discover what is relevant for them, there is more likely to be an educational encounter between my students and me.

LABELS AND THE WORTH OF A PERSON

In the years ahead perhaps we will be more able to value a wider variety of students because of their inherent worth as people. Perhaps, for example, we will value a striving member of a minority group more as an individual whose worth as a person is sufficient basis for our attention and concern rather than as an example of success in

representing his group well. Perhaps, also, we can involve ourselves with students less able and less bright who deserve access to opportunities for learning. Our purposes in valuing and devaluing students are subtle indeed.

Not long ago a clinical psychologist in a university counseling center worked diligently with a young lady whose success in college was not marked by high scholastic achievement. Over time he was indeed helpful to this young lady; she started him on his way to becoming a good counselor. In a conference he discussed his interest in her, and out of the discussion he discovered that he had come to value her during the early phases of counseling, despite her unattractive features and low marks, because her scholastic aptitude test scores were beyond the 95th percentile. And he finally came to discover, with some embarrassment, that in all probability he would not have regarded her as a "worthwhile case" had her score been below the 20th percentile. Does a test score tell us the worth of a person?

These labels plague us in the university world. Consider what we must do unwittingly, without awareness, to "bad" students, "unmotivated" students, and to a host of other types that somehow displease us and therefore become "unworthy."

As for the student, where can he find adults with whom to identify in the process of his own development as a person if he does not seek the symbols and the labels that we value, if he is not high on the test scores, if he is not a striver and grade-getter? It is small wonder that so many students in the state universities take themselves off the race track, hoping for some sort of meaningful self-realization and development outside.

WHO HELPS THE FACULTY?

Sometimes I get the impression that the switch has been made from blaming the students to blaming the faculty for some of the problems we now face on large campuses in our efforts to make the learning experience and environment a more personal world. It is easy to blame either group--the students for being reluctant scholars or not scholars at all and the faculty for being less interested in the students than in other matters.

In considering what to do about our dilemmas, it seems unlikely that faculty members are going to do any more than they are now doing. Moreover, it may be that faculty members are not going to be changed greatly through exhortation, consultative relationships, education, or even psychotherapy.

Consequently, rather than to limit the focus on the individual psychology of students, it seems more likely that these problems should be confronted on the basis of a social psychology or sociology of the campus in which a gigantic effort is made to change the value structure for faculty members, to reward teaching and evidence of interest in students as individuals, and to work our way toward a psychology of the individual faculty member.

There is little reason to believe that faculty members who want to be in relationships with students can themselves successfully stem the tide of competitiveness for research funds in a milieu where much is done for the good of education in general, but far less is done for the good of educating the individual student. Unless the university world is made a good deal more personal for the faculty it is not likely to be made more personal by the faculty for the students.

In addition to attempts to change the social value structure of the campus we also have to give additional attention to attracting different kinds of faculty members. This brings us to another possibility, which is to try to change the graduate school toward an emphasis on teaching and humaneness in relationships with others, instead of an emphasis on research. Parenthetically, I wonder if we are beginning to scapegoat the graduate schools for lacks in the faculty just as we formerly scapegoated the public schools because students somehow were not what we wanted them to be or did not know what we thought they should know. At the same time the graduate schools are vulnerable and not without some responsibility for the dilemmas we face.

If we look to faculty members as important persons whom students use in identifying with the intellectual values and learning within the university, the question must be raised: How do faculty members identify with their universities? We know that faculty members tend to identify with their disciplines on a national level and that they may serve many constituents. How important and influential are their students as constituents, as one audience? Who enables the faculty member to become a part of the university community? Does the president, the academic vice president, or the academic dean have as his unique responsibility the fostering of new definitions of faculty and university relationships?

On the local level faculty relationships with the university will vary among different specialties and according to professional interests, and will be affected by the value structure of the university rewards system. Whatever the factors, a faculty member who feels closely identified with his university is likely to be a different model from a faculty member

who feels little connection with his institution. A faculty member who sees himself as a good teacher is likely to model somewhat different attitudes and values from those modeled by a faculty member whose primary interest is research.

The attitudes, behavior, and budget decisions made by academic administrators certainly influence faculty relationships with the university. Faculty members are more likely to become involved in internal university affairs, even matters other than instruction, and come to feel a part of the university when they are valued for such involvement.

I would suggest, however, that the students themselves are potentially the most influential people in involving the faculty with the university, in making the university a more personal place for faculty members as well as for students. Students are likely to have more direct influence, of course, on the faculty members who care about teaching and who are willing to have some connection with students than on those who do not teach. Moreover, I am coming to believe that students are potentially the most influential agents for changing the value and rewards system within the university so that good teaching and the scholarly work it entails may be as important as basic research, publications, and grant getting.

PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

CAN UNIVERSITIES CHANGE?

The university, a source of developing new knowledge, now shows signs of willingness to discover knowledge of itself--its culture, its students and faculty. Recently, studying students in the university setting has become a halfway respectable activity for psychologists. Only the bolder or devil-may-care sociologists, even now, are willing to study the campus social systems in the face of pressures from their colleagues to do more "scholarly" work. The cultural anthropologists, to my knowledge, are still drawn to the rituals of tribes and cultures in faraway places rather than to the rituals and tribes on the campus. While we have been slow to study how to influence change in the university, we have begun to study how the university influences students.

Burgeoning studies of campus environments promise to tell us more about how to conceptualize the campus as a social system comprised of student and non-student cultures, and how the different campus subcultures influence student-faculty relationships and student learning.

A few private colleges are often cited as examples of colleges that influence students through reinforced student cultures which seem to grow out of a variety of programs and encounters among students and faculty members. Hopefully, some of the studies undertaken in the large urban universities will tell more about the subcultures of the campus and offer clues about how we can create, change, and take advantage of existing subcultures to promote individual and institutional values and to foster individual differences.

As we read the history of higher education, we may be struck by the profound influences one faculty member or administrator had on the development of an institution and its climate for learning. I wonder if it is still possible for one or even a few persons to excite the attention and attract the devotion of enough students and faculty members in the large university community to change the course of events and to foster a particular kind of climate? I would like to think so. Perhaps soon we will know enough to describe with clinical detail and objective accuracy the features of campuses where students, faculty, and administrators can bring about change and the characteristics of campuses where change seems unlikely if not impossible.

EVALUATION, NOT GRADES

If you want to intimidate students, give them unlimited freedom or more freedom than they can possibly use or know what to do with. If you want to intimidate faculty members, give them opportunities to teach on a give-and-take basis in any discipline or across disciplines without the security and protection of the structures of the department, of the courses and labels, and most of all, of the power inherent in the credit and grading system of the university.

I happen to believe that in the university of the future the grading system will have to go. I question whether or not it can be justified or defended on educational grounds. The system seems antithetical to the goals and processes of learning, not an inherent part of them. Grades have been likened to money by some observers and this is a good analogy. Students learn quickly how to use grades to barter; they learn what price they are willing to pay for what kinds of grades in what courses. Some pay dearly for grades that have shallow meaning while others pay whatever is necessary and come through with relative calm and detachment and without an encounter with learning. Again, like the barter system with money, grades get substituted for things that are more important; they become the symbols and get substituted for the essence.

In experience-centered learning, grades are irrelevant and become inconsequential. It should be noted, however, that there is a continuing need for evaluation by both students and faculty members, but an evaluation that focuses on what is learned in the deepest possible sense and what relevance the learning experience has for students and for faculty.

What is bothersome about the present wave of interest in student evaluations of faculty members and instruction is that the process possesses many of the same weaknesses inherent in the way faculty members evaluate students. The forms often ask the wrong questions, they are carried on by students without sufficient and direct faculty involvement and responsibility, and they take on the guise of objectivity where objectivity as such may not be important, or as important as intelligence and wise judgment about more subjective factors.

Again, one of the problems in the present systems of faculty grading and student evaluations of faculty is that they do not value or even allow for failure. Failure should be recognized as a vital part of learning, and we must be free to fail in order to grow, to develop, to change. Greater freedom to fail may allow us the imagination and resourcefulness to discover instances where failure actually may turn out to be success. This is another way of suggesting more openness to some of the outcomes of learning and some of the processes in which we engage.

While group psychotherapy may not be the mode of conducting classes, I have learned through such groups that individual behavior which appears to be self-defeating and destructive for both the person and other members of the group may become the most productive and constructive force in the group for helping the members and the individual to learn new coping behavior and to explore originally threatening but later enlightening ideas of how to help themselves and others! Again, what I am saying here implies no dichotomy between the student's everyday living or emotional life and his intellectual life. Quite the contrary, the total experience of the student is the best medium for integrating his total learning enterprise within the university.

SHORTCUTS ARE DECEPTIVE

The spirit of our time and culture encourages us to seek shortcuts and to streamline activities, and at the same time to seek greater participation in the diversity and richness of life available in our society. In keeping with this attitude, we find that there is so much knowledge and that it is developing so rapidly, we are having difficulty deciding what to teach by what process. Sometimes in looking at the

catalog and the listings of the courses I get the impression that knowledge is packaged for delivery.

There is so much to know that the student feels like a fraud if he masquerades as a liberally educated person--and so does the faculty member. But the expanding amount and complexity of knowledge makes it even more important that those of us interested in teaching and learning understand more about the relevance of learning for the individual student and his own development. I hasten to add, however, that to become a person the student needs more than himself to focus on as a primary aim in life. So does the faculty member! It is for this reason, among others, that it is futile and unnecessary to dichotomize sharply between knowledge and the student.

The curriculum and the faculty try to shortcut the world of experience for the student through selection of knowledge and planned learning activities. To some extent we actually can do this. We cannot do it, however, by packaging knowledge and handing the packages to students.

Students themselves also try to shortcut their development through bypassing or pretending to bypass some stages of behavior. This shows up largely through "acting out" behavior in some of the demonstrations and through the "beat movement" where students are reacting against a life they have little experienced or little understood. But it is difficult for either students or faculty to shortcut student development. Sooner or later the students are likely to discover that they have to fill in the gaps in their own background, in their own developmental processes.

We know that students are uneven in their development, that growing up is zigzag and also one-sided. It is not unusual for us to discover among students and faculty members intellectually gifted persons who are stunted emotionally. It is surprising that so many of our students are unaware of their deeper feelings and live under the surface of their skin by responding to the more superficial emotions.

Often burdening intellectual demands encourage students to suppress their emotions as though these were not a part of the basis for a person's achievement and development, even for the most effective rational life. Consequently, students who appear to be grown up physically and who have mature and thoughtful ideas often are naive and lacking in any sense of understanding of their own inner emotional life.

In the university of the future we will need to distinguish those shortcuts which are genuinely helpful from those

which are harmful, those experiences which are basic to student development from those which are superfluous, those activities which facilitate continued student learning from those which foster disenchantment and alienation from the educational enterprise. Progress will be made indeed when we can specify those learning experiences which provide a blend of emotion and intellect having relevance simultaneously for faculty and for students.

ONE LIFE FOR STUDENTS

For the student, campus life and intellectual life need not hold antithetical values. To fail to recognize this in learning programs is to lose much of the vitality of both in contributing to student development. The experience-centered world outside the classroom can no doubt give meaning to intellectual encounters, just as the world of ideas and intellectual excitement in classroom work and instruction at its best can be brought to the problems and experiences which students encounter in campus activities.

It seems likely that students will have to take the initiative in bridging this cultural divide. Faculty members and staff have been either disinclined or unsuccessful at the task. It is true, of course, that as more faculty members become interested in what students do outside the classroom and as psychologists and sociologists attempt to understand student use of campus activities for their development, there is closer communion. In the main, however, the institutional structure in the large university is against a merging of the two cultures and the discovery that both can be complementary and serve as the larger curriculum.

FROM FACULTY ADVISING TO FACULTY AND STUDENT MODELS

For years we have watched programs of faculty advising and counseling initiated enthusiastically, flourish perhaps for a period, and then disappear or fade into perfunctory tasks of routine registration advising. Occasionally programs are kept alive and seem to manifest some special vitality that is nourished by the institution's climate and value system. My experience has been that these programs seldom survive for long in the university. We attribute the causes of failure to: (a) lack of faculty interest; (b) lack of time for such activities; (c) lack of know-how and staff development opportunities for faculty participants; and (d) failures to build the advising activities into the university value and rewards system.

These causes no doubt are relevant, but there are other perhaps more vital causes. One problem is that for freshmen

we have no effective way of discovering a basis for meaningful student-faculty relationships in advising. Faculty members have not had opportunities to be accepted or rejected as models by the freshmen. Nor have they been stimulating inspirational teachers.

I would like to suggest that we turn the system upside down and allow juniors and seniors to choose faculty advisers who are models and then study the nature of the relationships and the uses students and faculty can make of them.

Faculty members who are chosen and who are willing to participate in such a program would be receptive to learning about student development, sensitive to the problems students face, and perhaps open to understanding the processes by which students and faculty members enter into real encounters. I have no doubt that such an experience involving faculty members and students would contribute both to faculty conceptions of students and to their conceptions of teaching.

One of our problems in the universities is that we want freshmen to behave as though they were graduate students--or junior faculty members. Accordingly, we organize the system to induce student-faculty relationships to lead to this kind of behavior and it does not come about. Still, this does not mean that we cannot discover ways to foster meaningful relationships between faculty members and incoming students. Traditionally, and perhaps rightfully, we think of faculty members as the logical persons for freshmen to emulate. At the same time we know that there are not enough accessible faculty members who appeal to freshmen.

We have not begun to utilize as resourcefully as we can the vast potential that the upperclassmen possess in doing important work with entering lower division students. What exciting possibilities the use of upperclassmen holds for working in a continuing fashion with entering freshmen, perhaps alongside some of the faculty members! The upperclassmen themselves, of course, would be the greatest benefactors and reap rewards from attempts to discover and understand the problems of entering freshmen and to bring the resources of the university to bear on them. More importantly, the upperclassmen would gain through striving to be humane persons who harness thoughtful and honest concerns into action programs for other persons who are entering their university world. Such programs, moreover, could offer opportunities to enable both freshmen and upperclassmen to strengthen their identification with the institution.

Faculty members and administrators may hold that encounters with freshmen are the prerogative of the faculty.

The use of upperclassmen as models cannot be overlooked, however, particularly if the upperclassmen can take as their models some of the professors with whom they have established meaningful relationships. Thus, in setting up a system whereby juniors and seniors can work closely with faculty models they have chosen out of the course of their university experience, these upperclassmen may then participate in experience-centered learning through work with entering students. If students are valued as part of the academic community, the entering freshmen need not feel that they are getting second best, that they are being shunted off to "student assistants."

While I am making a case for students and faculty members to engage directly in experiencing the world around them and for more intimacy in relationships, I also want to recognize the need for them to get away from intimacy, to get away from small groups, or to get lost in a crowd. Certainly the universities can provide healthy diversions and even escapes from intimacy that no small college can imitate.

FEW FEMALE MODELS

By now it may be clear that I am very much interested in the ways students use faculty members as models. A pertinent observation is that universities are notably lacking in mature adult female scholars and teachers who may serve as subjects of emulation among students. I know few women university professors with whom both male and female undergraduates might identify in their own search for self-definition. Fewer women complete the Ph. D. degree. Those who do, if they are married, need to be where their husbands work and may take time out of their careers to have babies and raise families. Women often may be discouraged from entering an academic career in the large university because it is more difficult for them than it is for men to reach tenure appointments. Why this is so is not entirely clear. I suspect that there is a good deal of stereotyping of women. The fact that we cite as unusual the examples of able women we know in academic life may be testimony of our own subtle prejudice and stereotypic ways of looking at women in professional life.

But the point of this comment is not the problem of prejudice toward professional women, but the need for them in the education of young men and women in the universities. While there may be no experimental evidence to show clearly how they would contribute as models for students in the academic community, I hope that we can formulate some interesting and sensible hypotheses that can be checked out in the research--both for male and female modeling.

TRANSITIONAL SEMINARS FOR SENIORS

We have been diligent in developing orientation programs for students entering the large universities. I would like to suggest that we give attention to a different kind of orientation program for seniors, for students who are leaving the university and who are in transition from the university world to the larger society.

Many seniors are beset with doubts about the future, about what their college education means now that they are about to leave. Contacts in discussions with student leaders in their senior year often reveal the depth of their concern about what they are going to do next, not simply in the professional world but with their own lives in deeply personal ways. Students in campus leadership positions may be inclined to look back to question whether or not they spent their time wisely in the activities in which they engaged. I would like to suggest that it may be worthwhile to institute programs of orientation of a very special sort to provide opportunities for seniors to have close contacts with faculty members and other adults to explore their natural and healthy concerns about themselves and about the future.

Seniors probably are examining the validity of their values now more closely than they have before. College seniors developing new kinds of expectations for the adult world can no longer use the somewhat protective institutional setting of the college either for support or for justification of immaturity if it still persists. Nevitt Sanford points out from the Vassar studies that old values may have been tossed aside, but new values and self-identities have not been formulated clearly with sufficient stability and confidence to be considered reliable.[1]

It is rather surprising that more universities have not set up senior seminars in which small groups of seniors, with interested, perceptive, and knowledgeable faculty members, can have an opportunity to explore their development, aspirations for the future, and connections with the immediate past. We probably would continue to discover both similarities and differences in the concerns of men and women, but women are bothered more than before about how to integrate the roles of career, marriage, and educated woman in the community.

---

[1] "Knowledge of Students Through the Social Studies," Spotlight on the College Student, Margaret L. Habein, editor, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1959, pp. 47-89.

STATE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

We may feel discouraged with the state of higher education because so much of what goes on in universities has little to do with the education of students as persons and because so many of us get so caught up in research, consultation, the preparation of lectures and speeches, and academic huckstering generally that we have few significant contacts with students. On this state of affairs, Professor J. Glenn Gray of the Philosophy Department of Colorado College, writing in the May, 1965 issue of Harper's[1], warns that "...we deepen the rift between the generations and at the same time increase the sense of impersonality, discontinuity, and absence of community that makes college life less satisfactory in this decade than it used to be..." Professor Gray continues, "...nowadays nearly everyone looks to education for salvation as once we had looked to religion or to a political ideology. But before we succeed in building the Great Society, we shall need to resolve the doubt and bafflement about its validity and worth in the minds of those who are in college who should serve as leaders. Many of the harrassed young men and women I teach, at any rate, have not yet decided what sense, if any, their existence has."[1]

We may feel greatly encouraged, however, in the current attention given to understanding students and in evidence that some faculty members do devote time and attention to understanding students and to helping them make knowledge relevant to their lives. I feel a sense of elation in what seems to be a growing concern among students for their own education. Students are seeking to become engaged with each other, with their universities, and with the world. I am heartened by student interest in their own college and university experience and am encouraged that their own education may become one of their causes. It is a worthy one and one they can do something about.

Higher education is much in the public eye, and powerful professional, political, and social forces are at work to mold it to serve the public good. But, for me the most exciting development in this decade is the prospect for active involvement of students in the affairs of higher education and in the educational process.

This talk has represented a kind of smorgasbord of ideas and comments on higher education. In different ways

---

[1]"Salvation on the Campus: Why Existentialism Is Capturing the Students," Harper's, Vol. 230, May, 1965, pp. 53-59; quote from p. 59.

I have tried to say that the university can and should be a personal place for learning and for development both for the students and the faculty. But students and faculty, mostly the students, will have to see to it that the needed educational reforms are brought about. Too, students and faculty members must become willing to know and to be known to each other and to share their authentic concerns while experiencing the frustrations and joys of learning and of living as people.